

28. (Canceled)

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on February 19, 2002, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 17 and 20 are amended, claims 22-28 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-11, 13-18, 20 and 21 are now pending in this application. The amendments more particularly describe what Applicant considers the invention. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification, and in particular in FIG. 2 and on page 6, lines 6-14. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been introduced with the amendments.

Affirmation of Election

Restriction to one of the following claims was required:

Group I: Claims 1-11, 13-18, 20 and 21

Group II: Claims 22 and 23

Group III: Claims 24-28

Applicant elects to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-11, 13-18, 20 and 21.

The claims of the non-elected invention, claims 22-28, are hereby canceled without prejudice. However, Applicant reserves the right to later file continuations or divisions having claims directed to the non-elected inventions.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-11, 13-18, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kikinis, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,732). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en

banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, “[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that Kikinis does not teach each and every element of Applicant’s claims.

For example, claims 1, 17 and 20 as amended each recite a keyboard comprising “a housing having substantially a form factor of a standard personal computer keyboard.” In contrast, Kikinis at FIGs. 1-6 describes a laptop computer capable of receiving a PDA module. Thus, Kikinis does not teach each element of claims 1, 17 and 20 because the laptop housing in Kikinis does not have substantially a form factor of a standard personal computer keyboard.

Furthermore, the only keyboard in Kikinis that has substantially a form factor of a standard personal computer keyboard is illustrated in FIG. 20. However, the keyboard illustrated in FIG. 20 suffers from the same problems that Applicant’s claimed invention solves, that is, the problem of managing devices that have extraneous cabling on the desktop. As is clearly illustrated in FIG. 20, the PDA module is attached to the keyboard using a cable. The keyboard in Kikinis does not teach or disclose a housing with a cavity or other mechanism for holding an external device. If anything, Kikinis teaches away from Applicant’s invention. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 20.

Claims 2-11 and 13-16 depend from claim 1; claim 18 depends from claim 17; and claim 21 depends from claim 20. Each of these dependent claims inherit the elements of their respective base claims and add further patentable distinctions. These dependent claims are therefore not anticipated for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-11, 13-16, 18 and 21.

Furthermore, in addition to disclosing each and every element of the claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); MPEP § 2131. With respect to claims 2-4, 18 and 21, Applicant notes that the Office Action

states that the docking bay of Kikinis discloses a housing having a plurality of surfaces defining a cavity shaped so that the device fits into the cavity such that at least on surface of the device is exposed, citing FIG. 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Kikinis does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained the claim. All that is illustrated in FIG. 5 is that the PDA module can be inserted into a docking bay. FIG. 5 does not illustrate the extent to which the PDA module is enclosed by the docking bay. For example, the PDA module might be wholly enclosed by the docking cavity leaving no surface exposed. As a result, Kikinis does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in claims 2-4, 18 and 21. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4, 18 and 21.

With respect to claim 5, the Office Action states that Kikinis discloses that top and bottom surfaces of the device are flush with the corresponding surface of the housing. Applicant notes again that Kikinis does not teach the extent to which the PDA is enclosed in the docking cavity, therefore Kikinis does not teach or disclose that the PDA module is flush with any surface of the housing. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5.

With respect to claim 16, the Office Action states that Kikinis discloses that device 10 is a telephone handset, citing column 14, lines 27+. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of Kikinis. The passage cited in the Office Action and FIG. 11 clearly indicate that device 10 is docked into a telephone 45, not that device 10 is a telephone handset. Thus Kikinis does not teach that the device is "selected from the group of devices comprising a remote control for a television, a digital video disc (DVD) player, a compact disc (CD) player, and a telephone handset." Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6954) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

KEITH A. KOZAK ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402

(612) 373-6954

Date August 19, 2002 By Rodney L. Lacy
Rodney L. Lacy
Reg. No. 41,136

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 19th day of August, 2002.

Name Rodney L. Lacy

Signature Rodney L. Lacy